IFW

Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031 U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE er the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. Application Number TRANSMITTAL Filing Date **FORM** First Named Inventor Art Unit (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing) **Examiner Name** Attorney Docket Number 3 Total Number of Pages in This Submission **ENCLOSURES** (Check all that apply) After Allowance communication Fee Transmittal Form Drawing(s) to Technology Center (TC) Appeal Communication to Board Licensing-related Papers Fee Attached of Appeals and Interferences Appeal Communication to TC Petition (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) Amendment/Reply Petition to Convert to a **Proprietary Information** After Final **Provisional Application** Power of Attorney, Revocation Status Letter Affidavits/declaration(s) Change of Correspondence Address Other Enclosure(s) (please **Terminal Disclaimer Extension of Time Request** Identify below): Request for Refund **Express Abandonment Request** CD, Number of CD(s) Information Disclosure Statement Remarks Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53 SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT Firm Robert R. Lawson Individual name Signature Date CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below. Typed or printed name R. Lawson Date Signature

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.



Response to a Restriction Requirement

Application SN 10/609,226

This communication is a response to a requirement for restriction having a mailing date of 05/05/2004 and setting forth a shortened statutory period for response of one month which would expire on 06/05/2004.

The applicant has studied the examiner's action carefully and has come to the conclusion that some of the examiner's holdings are confusing.

First of all, the applicant agrees with the examiner's restriction of claims 1 - 8 as being drawn to a swimming pool and a grating group I and group I, claims 9 - 13 drawn to a method of assembling a grating for a swimming pool. The applicant does not agree with the reasons for holding theses two inventions distinct from each other. The examiner should have stated that the claimed method of group I would be capable to make a different product.

From the examiner's action it appears that if the applicant elects group I, drawn to a swimming pool and grating, there appears to be a further election of species requirement and that is the claimed invention directed to the patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: Fig. 1, Fig. 2, Fig. 4 and Figs. 8 - 6.

The applicant is totally confused about this holding by the examiner. There are no different species claimed in the claims 1 -8. The Figs. identified by the examiner do not disclose or claim different species or embodiments, they are all the same. The Figs. identified by the examiner show the progressive installation of the swimming

pool bars and not new or different species (embodiments). Therefore, the examiner cannot hold different species, There are no different species.

The above comments are not a traverse of the restriction requirement but are a rebuttal to the examiner's holding in that the examiner is incorrect.

Before continuing in the prosecution on the merits of this application, the examiner is respectfully requested to identify the different and claimed species in Figs. 1, 2, 4, and 8 - 6. As far as the applicant is concerned there are no different species or different embodiments in these Figs.

Therefore, the examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the issued requirement for restriction.

The applicant makes a provisional election in the restriction requirement to be prosecuted claims 9 - 13 under a modified traverse.

The applicant has tried numerous times to contact the examiner by telephone to discuss the above noted issues. There was no answer.

Bobert B. Lawson

Date of Signature:

5/26/04